DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 839 SP 028 768

AUTHOR Etheridge, Carol P.
TITLE Student Perspectives of the Lyndhurst Program: Cycle I.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., TN. Center of Excellence in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 49p.; For related documents, see SP 028 766-767.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Mentors; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Program Length; Stress Variables; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Extended Degree Programs; Lyndhurst Fellowship Program

ABSTRACT

This study reports the perspectives of the 11 Lyndhurst Fellows in the 1985-86 fifth-year teacher preparation program. Data were collected via written surveys and tape recorded interviews, grade runners, memos, application forms, and program descriptions. The survey questionnaire sought opinions on the following topics: (1) reasons for interest in the program; (2) admission requirements; (3) expectations of the program; (4) coursework content and instruction; (5) stress factors; (6) internship orientation; (7) initial problems; (8) activities; (9) mentoring observations; (10) mentoring feedback; (11) mentoring relationships; (12) mentoring activities; (13) non-mentoring relationships; (14) likelihood of a long teaching career; and (15) recommending the program to others. A summary is presented of the major perceptions of the Lyndhurst Fellows and responses to the survey questionnaire are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280839

Student Perspectives of the Lyndhurst Program

Cycle I

Carol P. Etheridge

Center of Excellence - Teacher Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN
November, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.P. Etheridge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SP 028 768

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
RECRUITMENT	1
Reasons for Interest	
Admission - Requirements	
Expectations of the Program	
COURSEWORK	4
Content	
Instruction	
STRESS FACTORS	11
INTERNSHIP	15
Orientation	
Initial Problems	
Activities	
Mentoring	
Observations	
Feedback	
Mentoring Relationships	
Activities	
Attributes	
Non-mentoring Relationships	
LIKELIHOOD OF A LONG TEACHING CAREER	31
RECOMMENDING THE PROGRAM	31
SUMMARY	31
APPENDIX	37

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to learn the perspectives of the 1985-86 class of Lyndhurst Fellows regarding the Lyndhurst program. It is part of the program's evaluation and is intended to provide a framework for understanding the program processes, and a basis upon which to develop strategies to be used in the evaluation of future Lyndhurst and fifth year teacher preparation programs.

Data were collected from the eleven Lyndhurst Fellows via written surveys and tape recorded interviews within one month after completion of their internships and one-and-one-half months prior to graduation. Documents such as grade runners, memos, application forms and program descriptions were also examined.

Interviews, survey comments and documents were content analyzed and frequencies calculated from the quantitative data. Reliability of the data is established through triangulation of data from the various sources.

RECRUITMENT

Source of Information About the Program

There was no one source from which most Lyndhurst Fellows learned about the program. The most frequently cited source was the newspaper with four (36.4%) reporting this as their source. Three (27.3%) heard about the program

from a friend and the rest cited miscellaneous sources including a state evaluator and a professor at a foreign language conference.

Reasons for Interest

When asked what about the program interested them, certification and expedient certification received seven (63.6%) responses each. The stipend attracted five (45.5%) Fellows (see Table A-2, Appendix A). Thus, opportunity for certification and availability of a stipend were the main attractions to the program.

Admission Requirements

When asked if the general selection procedures for the program were appropriate four (36.4%) responded that they were appropriate, four respondants did not know and three (27.3%) responded that they were inappropriate.

Regarding entrance requirements, the survey revealed that Fellows felt that most of the requirements for admission to the Lyndhurst program were appropriate. Eleven (100%) agreed with requiring completion of an academic major and satisfactory recommendations (see Table A-3, Appendix A). Nine (81.8%) responded that above average performance on the basic skills test is appropriate.

Six (54.5%) responded that above average performance on the National Teachers Exam (NTE) is an inappropriate admission requirement.

Expectations of the Program

Interview data revealed that prior to entering the Lyndhurst program the Fellows had various expectations of programs in the College of Education including the stereotype that education is not professional or difficult. However, the Fellows overwhelmingly expected the Lyndhurst program to be professional, difficult and of high quality. The following statements represent this view:

> I thought this program would be very professional. I realized that the teaching field is not so professional to me and a lot of people look sort of down on the profession (teaching). But, in this program, I thought, 'Now we're taking education up to real professionalism'.

> I expected to work. I really expected to be around people of ideas and people who were academic.

Thus, while Fellows, upon entry into the program, were aware of negative stereotypes about education they expected to be part of a program that would prove the stereotypes wrong.

COURSEWORK

Content

Most of the coursework in the program was pedagogic. When asked if there were pedagogic competencies that were needed but not taught six (54.5%) of the eleven Fellows responded yes, two (18.2%) responded no and three (27.3%) did not know (see Table A-4, Appendix A). Six (54.5%) Fellows responded that they lacked pedagogic knowledge that should have been taught and five (45.5%) did not know.

Interviews revealed several areas in which Fellows felt lacking. First, they desired more methods specific to particular content as the following excerpt suggests:

> I think we all need more methodology in our (content) area. We were given general work (methods) and not very much specific work.

They suggested that specialized methods classes be taught during the summer before the internship so they would better understand how to teach their content when beginning their internships. Wanting content methods earlier reflects their desire for coursework that was directly applicable to what they were doing in their teaching situations. Consider the following statements:

> Well, I think that some of the things that I thought were a waste of time are state certification requirements such as special education. Learning theory did not help me

> in the least in instructing my class. I had thirty advanced placement students and thirty-five general students which kept me busy, especially the advanced placement. They were all seniors and I needed the time more in curriculum development rather than theory...I tried the games for increasing thought and things like that and I really didn't feel like they were working too well...
>
> ...I thought that in special education we would learn how to cope with gifted children and we really didn't learn anything except PL 94142...I think that you need to (teach) something about if you have a slow learner this is how you should deal with this specific learning problem or if you cannot get a child to read, some things that other people have done that are effective, some motivation, or how to. I don''t know...
>
> (one instructor) helped me totally change the way I was teaching Spanish. I was teaching on a grammatical approach. She helped me to change around and work in a lot more oral.

In retrospect, Fellows identified Analysis and Practice in Teaching as the high point of the coursework component of the program for the content it included but also for the way it was taught. The following statements reflect the consensus of the group:

> ...video taping, we enjoyed that, not while we were doing it, we hated it. But it really put us on the spot. It put us under the magnifying glass. When you got into a teaching situation the pressure was off because we had been scrutinized so closely. I think that was a high point.
>
> We all thought that it was lousy, that (the professor) was doing a terrible job 'cause all along (the professor) was making us do all these things that we didn't want to

do. But in the end it all fell into place. It was a very good course...

Regarding classroom management, Fellows found the book to be very useful but concern was voiced that not enough was taught in class about the topic:

> ...the book was good, it is a good little book. But the one teacher that taught knew no classroom management techniques...we had a whole three hour lecture on how to access information at the ERIC system. That doesn't have anything to do with what I need to know. I need some real concrete information and I am not getting it except from the book.

Fellows were satisfied with what they had learned about grading and evaluating objective tests but felt inadequate when grading essays or subjective work as this statement suggests:

> We did not have enough, as far as I am concerned, on how to grade anything subjective. Now objective we know. We had a good course on how to make out the objective test...that was fine...at least give us some pointers on how to grade different type essays.

Fellows found efforts to teach them about using technology to be useful but inadequate. This Fellow's view is representative:

> I think the class where they try to demonstrate some audio visuals was really good. We were supposed to go do some audio visuals on our own which if you don't know how to run a film projector you still don't know how to run a film projector by the time you get through. I think that maybe a couple days in the program should be spent on teaching me how to load a film projector,

> load a slide projector, do a thermofax, a couple things like that.
>
> I had to show a film the first of the year and I had no idea how to do it. I had to get one of my kids to come up and show me how to do it which didn't bother me, but I think that if I had known how, I would have been a little bit happier about it.

The seminar, which extended over the course of the entire program, was one component about which Fellows had strong feelings. Their opinions related to when in the semester the seminar was meeting and what their needs were at the time as this comment suggests:

> The seminars during the summer were pretty helpful. We were given some pretty good information, some practical information. We were able to get together and discuss and get closer as a group. As the year went on it just became unnecessary and I thought it was a waste of time that could have been spent in a more practical way.

As the Fellows became more involved in their internships they saw less value in the seminars as they were formatted. They enjoyed seeing their cohorts but desired more concrete content rather than a sharing of experiences. Consider these comments:

> It was nice to go every week because we could see our friends there. That was good to keep in touch. But to go for two or two and a half hours and relate to their (other Fellows) interests, it was a waste of time. If that was all it was going to end up being then it should not have lasted.

> ...if we had had them once a month instead of once every week and if we could have gotten together and discussed mutual problems that we were having, share that sort of thing, it could have been more practical.

In sum, regarding pedagogic course content, Fellows wanted to learn all the practical applications they needed before beginning their internships. Thus, they would prefer to have specialized methods during the summer. They felt deficient in the areas of specialized methods, classroom management, grading essays, teaching gifted and slow learners, and using educational technology.

When they became involved in their internships they had difficulty valuing coursework that did not directly relate to their in-school experiences.

Instruction

When asked about the methods of instruction in the pedagogic coursework opinions were mixed. Four (36.4%) Fellows responded that instructional methods were appropriate, five (45.5%) said no, they were not appropriate. Individuals who were unhappy voiced their concerns in terms of professors who were not perceived as good role models. This person is representative:

> The class lasted three hours and (the professor) lost everyone in the first ten minutes. That was one thing that I really had trouble with. These people were educators, especially since this was my first experience with the College of Education, and here they were trying to tell me how to hold the class's attention and they lost mine in the first ten minutes.

Likewise, when Fellows were pleased with instruction they voiced their opinions in terms of the professors who were perceived as good role models:

> What she did this summer was wonderful. We didn't like her, we were mad at her because she was so demanding. I mean, she, to me, is a role model for a perfect teacher. She really is. She was demanding, she didn't care about our getting upset, and she insisted on the highest standards, and she evaluated accordingly...and she's extremely helpful.

They also found and admired instruction that was painless:

> She made us learn how to teach and she did not do it in a way that we knew we were learning anything which was so amazing. I was thinking about that the other day...

But Fellows became particularly upset with professors who came to class unprepared. When this happened the Fellows felt the content was weak or absent and they resented the lack of improvement when they complained. The following statement illustrates this concern:

> ...a lot of times, I would say the majority of the time, he would come in and just try to wing it. Then (when we complained) (the professor) would get defensive and say, 'Well, you're not being flexible, and I'm not taking responsibility for your feelings.' It caused a lot of problems because we would try to object and he would get very defensive and try to throw it back on us.

Grading was mentioned as a problem in some classes. According to interview data, sometimes

nothing was mentioned all semester about how grades would be determined until the end when a test was given that was sometimes unrelated to course content. The following comment will clarify:

> Toward the end of the term (the professor) would have to give us a test. He would come up with something so as to have a final over it. It was usually go out and get an article and write an essay on it which was ridiculous because all of a sudden you've got to give a grade and we haven't done anything. There was no direction toward a grade all semester long...

At other times Fellows were not given feedback regarding work they had done so they could not monitor their grades nor understand on what grades were based. The following exemplifies the concern:

> (I) was frustrated with grades in three (courses). (We) never got anything back. (I) was given a grade and not told how I got it.

Thus, regarding instruction, Fellows felt the program had good and bad. They wanted and found instruction that modeled what they were expected to do and they were pleased to discover and admired the instruction that caused them to learn without knowing it.

They also encountered instruction that they felt modeled poor teaching practices particularly in the areas of planning, motivation, and grading. They resented their time being wasted.

STRESS FACTORS

As might be expected in a program such as the Lyndhurst where several years of pedagogy are compressed into one, the Fellows experienced some stress directly related to the program's intensity. But stress due to other factors also existed.

Time, or lack of it, concerned the Fellows. Those with families had difficulty giving the attention to their family and to the program that they felt both deserved. Their stress was aggravated when they received no sympathy from program personnel. The following individual explains:

> I kill myself to do this. Sometimes we'll complain, say that's too much. (We're told) Well look, when you got in this program you knew that you had to give your everything. I don't agree with that. People have families they can't give everything. Nobody gives their everything to anything. So it has just been like do, do, do. The more we add on you doesn't matter, it doesn't matter how you feel.

The lack of closure to one segment of the program before starting the next was also stressful to some. After the summer term they would have liked a break so they could regroup for the internship. Consider the following:

> Most of us never got a breath. We went straight from the summer. In fact, I had to come back after I had started school (internship) to take finals. I never felt like I had a day off. (We were told to) take time off, you know, take a day off on the weekends. I never found that time. I just

> couldn't. I just didn't have the time to do that. So I think we all were exhausted. I think having to take a course at night where we had to do a little studying, I think that really got us as first year teachers.

So time alone was a pressure factor but having no break and teaching for the first time while taking university classes caused additional stress.

There was also the perception among the Fellows that they were being patronized or treated as children. They wanted some control over their nonclass time but were required to be in the college all day until 4:30 whether they were in class or not. Some viewed this requirement as lack of trust in them. Consider the following:

> I felt that they didn't trust us. That they felt we were just going to flake off if they didn't sit on us. And what happened is we did flake off. We sat in the halls all day long and talked. And nobody could concentrate. So in a way that did occur. I think what they were afraid of having happen, happened right in front of their eyes and there was nothing they could do about it.

Information flow to the Fellows, or lack of it, was stressful to some. They did not receive clarification or additional information about assignments, requirements, etc. when they asked. The lack of, or incomplete, information caused problems in completing program requirements for some individuals. This perceived dearth of information was interpreted as being treated like children:

> There have been some real negative feelings... As people coming into this program we've all lived in the real world and we've had other careers, most of us. I think a few came straight from undergraduate school but there's been a patronizing air -'I know what's best for you', and, 'you take my word'. It's just been a real bad situation, and some bad feelings.
>
> We were told in class last week that they are not able to recommend any of us for our credentials because two people did not take the NTE. We had no idea that there was this gravity involved. We're told, 'Well, you all may have to wait until next year to get your credentials now because of this.'
> I made a conscious decision to take the exam on June 28 because I didn't want to have to be bothered with it during the school year because my weekends are so short and crammed. Things like this came up every single week. When this came up I felt terrible and we didn't even know. It was like this all along. We didn't know until after the fact.

Another stress-causing factor was that the Fellows were encouraged to voice their concerns about the program or problems they were having in the internship or coursework but they felt nothing ever changed as a result. Thus, they became resentful and didn't see the purpose. One result was that they fabricated responses on the feedback forms. Consider the following:

> We're told we have input, but I've never been able to talk to anybody, except for those dumb feedback forms. A few of us think 'they're worth something, I don't. Every problem I've ever had has been beyond my head and I needed somebody to come and help me. and it hasn't been resolved. They ask, was it worked out to your satisfaction? Well, every time it's no, no, no and I got tired of

> writing them. But that's my grade and I have to write them. So half of them are not real. I mean I wrote them because that was a part of my grade. It wasn't because I've got a problem and I need help.

Some Fellows felt they did not receive help when they needed it. Concern was also voiced over the attitude of people running the program that if the Fellows did not like what was happening in the program they could drop out.

> ...if they don't like what you tell them they tend to say, 'Well, just drop out of the program if you don't like the way I do this.' I've heard this said to many people...You're talking about people who are intelligent, articulate, that you are trying to encourage to join the teaching profession and yet they have turned me off so bad, especially from the college of education. I hate it...If you don't like it get out of the program is not the (correct) attitude. You can tell by the numbers that we have lost...maybe they could have hacked it had they had a little bit better guidance...encouraged to continue...given another week....that is not wise to do with adult learners because they will get out. They don't have to be there.

Thus, from the Fellows' perspectives there were several stress factors in the program: the press of time due to a compressed program, no opportunity for a break between Summer and Fall terms, patronization of the Fellows, lack of information provided to the Fellows about program procedures, discrepencies between having Fellows ask for help or voice program concerns and action taken regarding the same, and lack of encouragement or help for those who consider quitting.

INTERNSHIP

For most Fellows, the internship was the high point of the Lyndhurst program. They felt they learned more through this experience than they could have learned in a university classroom. They identified several factors that contributed to the success of the internship. For some, the school administrator's attitude layed the groundwork for success. Consider this approach:

> From the first day I came here my principal had a wonderful attitude towards the Lyndhurst program. She was concerned that parents would think, well, I don't have a big old teacher, I have an intern teaching my children. So she went out of her way to bolster me in her public relations. At open house she said, 'We are very privileged to have a Lyndhurst scholar...' This really made a tremendous difference because the kids would come up and say, 'My mother says you're a big scholar from Memphis State.'...I always felt the principal was there and I could ask her little things.

Other interns found supportive atmospheres in their schools which contributed to the successful internship:

> The school that I was involved with was very, very supportive and helpful. Anything I wanted they showed me where to find it. If they didn't have it they took me to someone that did.

Other interns felt that they themselves made the internship successful. One person who felt things were not happening the way she would have preferred said she

decided to make the experience a successful one and thereby gained from it what she wanted.

Orientation

Interns were asked how they were oriented for their internships. Most interns (72.7%) responded that they had been oriented to their internship via a large group meeting. Six (54.5%) were oriented via seminar, five (45.5%) visited the site of the internship, five (45.5%) conferred with their mentors.

When asked to rate their internship orientation, four (36.4%) thought their orientation was good (see table A-5, Appendix A) and four thought it was poor. Their suggestions for improving the orientation included: earlier knowledge of the placement so they can prepare for it, opportunity to visit the school, faculty, staff before the internship, and better informing of school administration about the program.

Initial Problems

Interns were asked if there were initial problems with their internship placements. Seven (63.6%) responded yes. Most problems related to mentors not knowing what their responsibilities to the intern were or not even knowing they were to be a mentor. The following comment is illustrative:

> They told a lady that she would be the classroom mentor on Friday before I was to show up at her school on Monday morning. With no instruction on what to do it took us about two weeks to figure it out.
>
> Our mentor was not even aware that she was our mentor and the first day of in-service here we discovered who she was and went up to her and told her we were glad and she had no idea. So it was real disorganized.

In at least one instance the intern had no classes scheduled for her to teach until one week after school began. Another intern had no text books for the first three weeks of school. She had to

> ...go home every night and write a textbook and provide materials that I didn't have. I think it would have been an advantage to have those books ahead of time where I would have known what to expect.

Thus, most initial problems related to lack of communication with mentors and administrators about their responsibilities to the intern.

Activities

Most interns participated in the full range of school related activities during their internships. Ten (90.9%) or more participated in teaching, inservice, parent conferences, using school equipment, and school sponsored after school activities. Five (45.5%) was the lowest participation rate for any activity; professional meetings, homeroom, and co-curricular activities had this participation rate.

Seven (63.6%) interns would have liked more participation in homeroom activities. But almost none wanted more participation in inservice meetings or school sponsored after school activities (see Table A-6, Appendix A).

Mentoring

Throughout the internship three types of mentors worked with the Fellows: a classroom mentor who taught in the same school with the intern, a pedagogic mentor who was a professor in the College of Education, and an arts and science mentor who was a professor in the College of Arts and Science and practiced in the same discipline area as the intern. Their key roles were to observe the Fellows teach and provide feedback about the observed lessons for the purpose of improving the intern's teaching ability.

Observations

Six (54.5%) interns indicated that their pedagogic mentors observed them once every six weeks, two (18.2%) observed once each month (see Table A-7, Appendis A).

Two (18.2%) interns said their classroom mentors observed them teach once every few days and two interns said they were observed once every one or two weeks. Interview data revealed that in some cases observation

by the classroom mentor was not possible because of schedule conflicts.

According to interview data some arts and science mentors taught the specialized methods classes and through the classes more closely monitored the intern's progress. Other arts and science mentors were less accessible and had fewer contacts with their interns. When contacts were few the interns were likely to take the responsibility for the low contact rate though both were responsible for the lack of contact as this excerpt suggests:

> I really like her but she is real busy and we didn't really even establish rapport until January. It's a fifty-fifty responsibility as far as I can see. I should have been in contact with her. I had her name back in June and I just never got together with her. It was really my responsibility to contact her.

Those interns who were not observed very often did not seem to mind but did wonder if things might have gone better if they had more contact with their mentors as this protege suggests:

> ...my feelings toward (the mentor) are a little lackadaisical. I could have used some direction and help. I mean, I made it without it but if I had (direction) it would have been nice.

Regardless of the regularity or frequency of mentor observations, most interns were satisfied. Some,

whose mentors observed infrequently, wondered if they could have done better with more frequent observations

Feedback

All interns reported that their pedagogic mentors provided feedback about observed lessons immediately after the lesson. Five (45.5%) interns said their classroom mentors provided feedback immediately after an observed lesson. Two (18.2%) said they received no feedback from their classroom mentors (see Table A-8, Appendix A).

Survey data summarized in Table 1 reveals that the interns viewed feedback provided by classroom and pedagogic mentors as more supportive and encouraging than it was specific, helpful or constructive. However, all ratings were positive.

TABLE 1

Lyndhurst
Description of mentor feedback

	Pedagogic		Classroom	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
*instructive - not instructive	2.364	1.362	2.9	1.853
specific - general	2.273	1.421	2.9	1.912
encouraging - not encouraging	1.727	1.272	1.7	1.337
helpful - not helpful	2.273	1.489	2.4	1.897
constructive - not constructive	2.273	1.555	2.5	1.581
supportive - not supportive	1.909	1.446	1.7	1.337

*scale ranges 1 to 5

Mentoring Relationship

Interns rated their relationships with the arts and science mentors as more helpful and successful than the relationships with classroom and pedagogic mentors. They had the most comfortable relationships with their classroom mentors. However the interns rated their relationships with all three mentors as comfortable, helpful, and successful. (see Table A-9, Appendix A).

Activities

It is interesting to note from Table 2 that according to intern responses none of the selected mentoring activities were engaged in by all three mentors and no activity was engaged in by all mentors or all mentors in any one category. Classroom mentors were more likely to have engaged in fourteen of the nineteen selected activities than the other two mentor -types with the category sharing knowledge of school and system policies, practices, etc. having the highest engagement rate. Observing and evaluating the intern's teaching was the activity most frequently engaged in by all three mentors.

TABLE 2

LYNDHURST
Summary of activities in which mentors engaged in their roles
N = 11

	College of Education		Classroom		A&S	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Assisted in planning for instruction	2	18.2	6	54.5	2	18.2
Shared knowledge about instructional strategies, techniques, etc.	6	54.5	8	72.7	7	63.6
Shared knowledge of school & system policies, practices, etc.	4	36.4	9	81.8	0	0
Scheduled regular meeting to discuss topics of mutual interest	5	45.5	4	36.4	4	36.4
Regularly monitored your activities	6	54.5	4	36.4	7	63.6
Introduced you to faculty/staff, parent and community people, system personnel	0	0	6	54.5	1	9.1
Observed & evaluated your teaching	10	90.9	8	72.7	8	72.7
Advised about potential problems	5	45.5	7	63.6	1	9.1
Shared info about upcoming school events	3	27.3	8	72.7	5	45.5
Served as confidant annd advisor	4	36.4	7	63.6	6	54.5
Helped solve personal problems	1	9.1	4	36.4	0	0
Served as advocate when needed	6	54.5	7	63.6	1	9.1
Defended you	1	9.1	5	45.5	0	0
Shared knowledge and nuances about working in the school system	7	63.6	8	72.7	3	27.3
Modeled exemplary instruction	2	18.2	5	45.5	6	54.5
Assisted in locating instructional technology	0	0	5	45.5	1	9.1
Shared knowledge about classroom mgmt	6	54.5	7	63.6	4	36.4
Assisted in undergoing state's/systems evaluation processes	3	27.3	5	45.5	0	0
Assisted with program related frustrations and issues	6	54.5	5	45.5	2	18.2

Attributes

Interview data revealed several characteristics which interns felt contributed to successful mentoring relationships. First, they wanted the mentor to be available as this intern suggests:

> I don't want somebody hanging over me all the time. I want to know that the person is there and available if I had problems but I don't want a constant (supervisor). I want to feel free to talk and to talk over problems but not a structured sort of thing.

Second, interns want their mentor to be positive. As one intern put it, "Mine's been so positive that when he comes I just feel a sigh of relief and that's the way I feel it should be."

Another characteristic associated with good mentors is that they are good listeners as this intern describes:

> They are good listeners. They gave me a lot of information but it was an easy way to accept it. You can be given advice by some people and it makes you angry and other people it makes you happy. We didn't get in that situatiion. When I needed someone to talk to they were willing to listen. They didn't say do this or that. They just listened to me. A lot of times I heard the answer coming from me and I just needed to tell someone.

The interns also valued mentors who were helpful and informative but with more than words. Consider the

following comment made by an intern about someone elses mentor whom she admired:

> She really helped them and showed them things in her file and said, 'Look, this is what I used'.

Interns also want their mentors to have taught recently or to be currently teaching in public schools so they can be realistic about classroom practices. They prefer that the mentors have knowledge of the intern's content area but do not feel it is a requirement if the other traits are present as these interns suggest:

> ...she doesn't know anything about my content area but she can help me with the practicalities of it. She can say this would probably work, I'm not sure, get a lab book, let's look it up. She will take her time to help me and not even make me feel like I'm imposing on her free time...

> ...he doesn't know anything about my subject material but he makes you believe that he does and he pays attention and takes notes about what you're talking about and then if he doesn't understand part of it after you get through he'll ask a question...

Interns really appreciated mentors who exerted extra effort for them as this mentor did:

> One day I needed some spring water and I was like, well, where do you get fresh spring water. She said, 'Well, my daughter has a horse out in the country.' She says, 'Come on after school we'll go out there and I know there's a fresh spring. We'll take some bottles and we'll collect some water.' She drove me out there, drug me through the woods and helped me collect this water. That was

> really kind, she took her after school time, her family time, to go out with me...

Thus, interns were generally pleased with their mentors and particularly liked mentors who were available, positive, good listeners, helpful, informative, realistic about classroom activities, and willing to exert extra effort on behalf of the intern.

Though intern ratings of the mentors were positive, interns identified factors which did not contribute to successful mentoring relationships. Lack of mentor initiative in contacting the protege was one inhibiting factor as this protege suggests:

> She never contacted me to ask me how I was doing. She was encouraging though. So I would have liked to see her more. I'd call her and three weeks later she'd call back and say, 'OK, well I'll come in two weeks' and then you know...

As the above excerpt reveals poor timing for visits was another inhibiting factor. The above mentor visited long past the time of need but the following excerpt illustrates how sometimes the timing of the visit makes it particularly threatening to the protege:

> I kind of like the fact that (the mentor) didn't come all the time. However (the mentor) is coming tomorrow to squeeze in a third time this semester. Tuesday is the last day of school and if I wind up doing anything wrong I can be evaluated. Consequently I worry about (the fact) that I am not doing anything special (for the mentor) to see.

At least one mentor-protege relationship was a complete disaster from the intern's perspective. The mentor seemed to be inflexible, non-facilitating, and lacking understanding of the mentoring role:

> My mentor did everything against me. I'd say, 'I'd like to do this.' The mentor would respond, 'Well, I wouldn't do it that way!'
>
> When I first started to try to do labs, I wasn't sure exactly what to do. I had thirty children, others in the department had fifteen. I wanted to work with my kids in four or five groups. (The mentor) liked to work in groups of two. I said I'd like to do this. He said, 'We don't have the lab (supplies).' We have a lot of (supplies) in there but I couldn't get him to order them. By me not knowing what I was really doing, I l just agreed. I didn't realize that maybe (the mentor) could have gotten some of the supplies. I went to the teacher one day in City High School where I went to school who ordered everything I needed. I thought, well, my mentor could have ordered them. But out of desparation I went back to City.
>
> ...Then my mentor decided, 'I want you to sit in my class' (so intern could observe the class and then teach her own). I would sit in the mentor's class and take notes with the students and go home and try and figure it out. That made me stay at least a week behind because I can't (observe) one day a week and go teach.
>
> (The mentor) teaches very, very different from the way I teach. Whenever I tried to teach like him, my kids were confused and so was I. So I stopped going for a while because I got confused...I started teaching my own way which my kids understood better...
>
> I couldn't get (the mentor) to sit down and say, 'What are you going to teach, what are your plans?' The mentor would always be telling me, 'Don't do a lab.' I have to give a lab. (The mentor) would say, 'No, don't do a lab yet.' (The mentor) did a lab and I had no idea, I found out from a student...I'm

> supposed to bring my class in the same day, no preparation, nothing written down for me to see in the lab. I take my class in and they're confused and I'm confused. Of course, it looks like I have no idea what I'm doing. You see, that's the way (the mentor) liked to keep me, in a situation where I looked totally confused.
>
> We were taking the AP class (on a field trip) and I asked to help. Well, (the mentor) took this other teacher. This is my mentor who is supposed to be teaching me and exposing me to things. (The mentor) has gone on three or four seminars. I said, 'Can I go?' I've never gone. I lost confidence in my mentor (who has) been of no help, nothing has (the mentor) done to make me a better teacher.

The above mentor was unsuccessful in the mentoring role though may have been unaware of the fact.

Even when mentors were conscientious about mentoring their feedback sometimes became a hindering factor to successful mentor-protege relationships. Sometimes the feedback was viewed as nit-picking and not dealing with what the intern thought to be important as in the following case:

> (My mentor) corrected my grammar. I said ra-she-o instead of ra-sho which is the correct pronounciation and brought me a dictionary to show me what pronounciation is correct. But no evaluation of my material or my content...

Some proteges were annoyed and viewed their mentors as incompetent when the mentor admitted they did not understand the content. However, their annoyance may have been a reaction to the context of the mentor's admission. Consider the following:

> First of all (the mentor) asked, 'Was the bulletin board yours?' I said, 'No, I'm a floating teacher and I don't have a room to call my own."...The next thing (the mentor) asked me was do other teachers at school wear pants and I said of course. I mean you can look around and see thirty-five other female teachers had on a pair of pants. Then (the mentor) said, 'I don't really know what you're teaching. I don't know if it is right or wrong but it sounded real good.' That was the basis of my evaluation. I was real displeased that the most important things were the bulletin board and my appearance rather than my content.

The above mentor's credibility was lost because of the selection of the material critiqued and how it was critiqued coupled with the admission of ignorance. As discussed earlier, other proteges reported that their mentors admitted the same ignorance of content but were successful mentors because of how they made the admission.

Proteges wanted some positive feedback. When it wasn't forthcoming they voiced their concern with comments such as, "It seems like they have to find something wrong," or "Do they have to find something wrong all the time?" Evaluation was also a factor interfering with the mentor-protege relationship. When a mentor has power of evaluation, the protege doesn't feel relaxed with the mentor for fear of offending the mentor with dire results as reflected by the following intern's fear:

> (You) can't offend your mentor because if you do then that reflects on your evaluation because it's a very subjective procedure. If you ever make this person mad then you may be the most outstanding teacher in the world but your evaluations are gonna reflect this, I believe.

Thus, from the protege's view, several factors existed which inhibited the establishment of successful mentoring relationships: lack of mentor's initiative in contacting the intern, poor timing of visits, inflexibility, non-facilitating, poor understanding of the mentor role, feedback that does not balance positive and negative, and poorly phrased feedback.

Non-mentoring Relationships

Most interns reported that they did not establish other, non-assigned, mentoring relatinships. However, when they were unable, for whatever reason, to get needed information from their mentors they usually developed other sources from which to obtain it. The primary and most prolific source of helpers and information was from the teacher's lounge as these comments suggest:

> Here in the lounge, my mentor introduced me to a lot of people. I was one who was warned against going to the lounge. I don't do it much any more. But the whole first semester I did it a lot. I think that probably benefitted me more than coming back here hiding in this cubby hole because I got to know people and if I needed something then I had someone to go to. I was given books by other teachers and materials other than my

> mentor's. I asked more than one person for advice if she (mentor) was not available. I had someone else I could go to and say, 'I need some help with this,' and that was good.
>
> ...especially the teachers who had their same period off that I did. We were real close in the lounge and they'd say, 'Well, you need to be doing this because they're not gonna tell you at Memphis State that this is important but this is something that you need to do.' I believe I trusted them more than I do anybody over here. Every time I ask somebody over here I get sixteen different answers so I just ignore everything they say and trust the people who teach, who know what's going on in the schools.
>
> The librarian, she got me started with everything over here, and any type of audio-visual type stuff - she helped me do it. I've been able to talk (with her) about some problems. Then there's the history teacher down here who was a real help. I asked, 'Well, how did you feel when you were a first year teacher?' She told me how she felt and some of the problems she had. Then there's the typing teacher, she talked to me in the lounge here too, she is very positive...

Thus, through the teacher's lounge, the interns were able to establish a variety of relationships which they believed helped them throughout the internship.

In some cases, all the teachers in the school were very supportive; wherever and whenever a need arose they helped the intern. Consider the following:

> I developed a dependency, I would say, on the help and cooperation of all the teachers at the school. I couldn't think of more than two or three teachers in the whole school that I haven't really gotten something from. I feel like as a group they all have been very helpful. Even though they are not there everyday they're always there if you

> have a problem. You don't even express it as a problem. They ask you how you're doing. Then if you give them a hint about some problem they're more than glad to help and tell what they went through and the empathy was really very important...
>
> I've been the baby at City School and if I needed anything somebody's gonna get it for me. They take care of me...

Thus, in many instances interns established supportive relationships with other teachers in the schools via the teacher's lounge or because of the generally supportive orientation of the school personnel.

LIKELIHOOD OF A LONG TEACHING CAREER

When asked about the likelihood of having a long teaching career was, eight (72.7%) responded very likely, two (18.2%) responded not very likely, and one (9.1%) did not know. Thus, most Lyndhurst Fellows look forward to a long teaching career. Comments on the survey and interviews revealed that one individual plans to return to her initial career after one year of teaching, one intends to move on to university level teaching, one plans to have a child, and two plan to obtain masters degrees.

RECOMMENDING THE PROGRAM

When asked if they would recommend the Lyndhurst program to others, nine (81.8%) responded yes, one (9.1%) responded no, and one did not know. The Fellows agreed that the rapidity with which they could become certified made the program very appealing. Even those who had major concerns about the program said they would do it again for the expedient certification.

SUMMARY

Following are the major perceptions of the Lyndhurst Fellows about the program:

1. Fellows learned about the program from the newspaper or friends.
2. Opportunity for certification and availability of a stipend were the main attractions to the program.

3. Fellows felt most admission requirements were appropriate. They did not like requiring average performance on the NTE as an exit requirement.

4. Fellows expected to be part of a difficult and high quality program.

5. Fellows desired to have all practical applications coursework prior to the internships and recommended that specialized methods be taught during the summer.

6. Fellows felt deficient in the following areas:

   a. specialized methods.

   b. classroom management.

   c. ability to grade essays.

   d. ability to teach gifted and slow learners.

7. Fellows were satisfied with most of the instruction they encountered in the program.

8. Stress factors of the program included the following:

   a. press of time due to a compressed program.

   b. no break between Summer and Fall terms.

   c. patronizing attitude toward Fellows by some program personnel.

   d. inadequate information dissemination to the Fellows regarding program requirements.

9. The internship was the high point of the program.

10. Primary factors contributing to successful internships were:

   a. positive attitudes of school administrators.

b. supportive attitudes of school staff.

11. Suggestons for improving the orientation for the internship included:

a. earlier knowledge of the placements.

b. opportunity to visit the internship school before starting the internship.

c. better informed school administrators regarding the program.

12. Most initial problems in the internship related to lack of communication with mentors and administrators about their responsibilities to the intern.

13. Once every six weeks was the mode for pedagogic mentor observations of the interns.

14. No pattern existed for frequency of classroom mentor observations of the intern.

15. Some classroom mentors did not have time to observe their proteges due to scheduling conflicts or lack of release time.

16. Most interns did not mind being observed infrequently by their mentors.

17. All pedagogic mentors gave feedback regarding observed lessons immediately after the observation.

18. Most classroom mentors gave feedback regarding observed lessons immediately after the observation.

19. All ratings of classroom and pedagogic mentor feedback were rated positively with the supportive and encouraging

categories receiving the highest ratings.

20. All ratings of mentor relationships were positive. Arts and Sciences mentors received highest ratings in the categories of helpfulness and success. Relationships with classroom mentors were rated highest in the category of comfort.

21. Attributes identified as contributing to successful mentor-protege relationships were:

a. availability.

b. positive attitude toward the intern.

c. good listener.

d. helpful.

e. informative.

f. realistic about expected classroom activities.

g. willingness to exert extra effort on behalf of the protege.

22. Attributes identified as inhibiting successful mentor-protege relationships were:

a. lact of mentor's initiative in contacting the intern.

b. poor timing of visits.

c. inflexibility.

d. non-facilitating.

e. lack of understanding of the mentor role.

f. feedback that does not balance positives and negatives.

g. poorly phrased feedback.

23. Interns established supportive relationships with other teachers in the schools primarily via the teacher's lounge but also through observing in classrooms.

24. Eight of the eleven Fellows thought they would have long teaching careers.

25. Nine of the eleven Fellows would recommend the Lyndhurst program to others because of the brief time it required to become certified.

TABLE A-1

Lyndhurst
How did you learn about the program?
N = 11

Source	Frequency	%
friend	3	27.3
professor	1	9.1
pamphlet/ brochure	–	–
newspaper	4	36.4
radio/tv	–	–
other	3	27.3

TABLE A-2

Lyndhurst
Why were you interested in the program?
N = 11

Reason	frequency	%
Part of a quality program	2	18.2
Stipend	5	45.5
Certification	7	63.6
Expedient certification	7	63.6
Convenience	2	18.2
Other	2	18.2

TABLE A-3

Lyndhurst
How appropriate was each admission requirement?
N = 11

	Appr*	Inapp**	Don't Know	missing
	n %	n %	n %	n %
Completion of academic major	11/100			
Completion of general studies	7/63.6	2/18.2	2/18.2	
Above average quality point average	6/54.5	4/36.4	1/9.1	
Admission to MSU graduate school	7/63.6	4/36.4		
Miller Analogies/GRE test scores	8/72.7	3/27.3		
Above average performance on basic skills test	9/81.8	1/9.1	1/9.1	
Above average performance on NTE	4/36.4	6/54.5	1/9.1	
Satisfactory recommendations	11/100			
Prior work with children	5/45.5	5/45.4	1/9.1	

* app = appropriate
** inapp = inappropriate

TABLE A-4

Lyndhurst
Regarding padagogic coursework
N = 11

	Yes		No		Don't Know		Missing	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Were there competencies you needed that were not taught?	6	54.5	2	18.2	3	27.3		
Did you encounter problems in completion of course requirements?	6	54.5	5	45.5				
Were the problems resolved?	4	36.4	6	54.5			1	9.1
Was there knowledge that should have been taught but was not?	6	54.5			5	45.5		

TABLE A-5

Lyndhurst
Student ratings of internship orientation
N = 11

	n	%	$\bar{X}$	SD
1 = Excellent	1	9.1		1.079
2 = Good	4	36.4		
3 = Fair	2	18.2	2.818	
4 = Poor	4	36.4		

TABLE A-6

LYNDHURST
Frequency fo participation in internship activities
N = 11

	Participated			Liked more Participation		
	yes n/%	no n/%	missing n/%	yes n/%	no n/%	missing n/%
classroom teaching	9/81.8	2/18.2		6/54.5	5/45.5	
faculty meetings	6/72.7	3/27.3		5/45.5	6/54.5	
professional meetings	5/45.5	5/45.5	1/9.1	5/45.5	5/45.5	1/9.1
inservice	10/90.9	1/9.1		1/9.1	10/90.9	
homeroom	5/45.5	6/54.5		7/63.6	4/36.4	
co-curricular activities	5/45.5	6/54.5		5/45.5	6/54.5	
parent conferences	10/90.9	1/9.1		3/27.3	7/73.6	1/9.1
observed mentor teach	8/72.7	3/27.3		5/45.5	6/54.5	
utilized school equipment, facilities	10/90.9	1/9.1		4/45.5	6/54.5	1/9.1
school sponsored activities in afternoon, weekends, evenings	10/90.9	1/9.1		2/18.2	7/63.6	2/18.2

TABLE A-7

Lyndhurst
At what intervals did your mentor monitor your teaching?
n = 11

Pedagogic	Classroom n/%	n/%
1/day		
1/few days		2/18.2
1/week		1/9.1
1/2 weeks		1/9.1
1/3 weeks		
1/month	2/18.2	
1/6 weeks	6/54.5	
Other	3/27.3	7/63.6

TABLE A-8

Lyndhurst
When did your mentor provide feedback after an observation?
n = 11

	Pedagogic n/%	Classroom n/%
Immediately after obs	11/100	5/45.5
End of day of obs		1/9.1
Sometime during week of obs		1/9.1
No feedback		2/18.2
Other		2/18.2 missing

TABLE A-9

Lyndhurst
Rating of student-mentor relationship

	Pedagogic		Classroom		A & S	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
*comfortable - stressful	2.182	1.4	1.6	1.35	1.54	1.29
helpful - not helpful	2.455	1.57	2.0	1.6	1.72	1.348
successful - unsuccessful	2.18	1.47	1.0	1.6	1.88	1.45

* scaled 1 to 5

TABLE A-10

LYNDHURST
Ratings of helpfulness of experiences other than coursework
N = 11

Experience	missing	ratings* 0 n/%	1 n/%	2 n/%	3 n/%	4 n/%	$\bar{X}$	SD
Seminars			7/63.6	3/27.3		1/9.1	1.54	.934
Teaching/ seminars		4/36.4	4/36.4	2/18.2		1/9.1	1.091	1.221
Microteaching labs			2/18.2	9/81.8			3.45	1.214
Classroom observation		1/9.1	1/9.1	3/27.3	3/27.3	3/27.3	2.545	1.293
Peer teaching		2/18.2		1/9.1	1/9.1	7/63.6	3.00	1.612
Lesson planning				1/9.1	1/9.1	9/81.8	3.727	.647
Materials development	1/9.1	2/18.2		2/18.2	2/18.2	4/36.4	2.46	1.713
Technology lab		1/9.1	7/63.6	1/9.1	1/9.1	1/9.1	1.455	1.428
Quality control groups	1/9.1	5/45.5	3/27.3		2/18.2		.900	1.197

0 = not applicable 1 = not helpful 2 = marginal
3 = somewhat 4 = very helpful